

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/716,762 | 11/19/2003 | Jung Pill Kim | 2003P52878US | 6173 |
| 46798 | 7590 04/05/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP | | | LAM, DAVID | |
| | CCLELLAN/INFINEON | | | · - · · · <u></u> · · <u>-</u> |
| 3040 POST (| OAK BLVD., | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SUITE 1500 | | | 2827 | |
| HOUSTON, | TX 77056 | | DATE MAILED: 04/05/2009 | 5 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | . \ | 4.4 | | |
|--|--|---|------------------|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | 1-11- | | |
| | 10/716,762 | KIM, JUNG PILL | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | David Lam | 2827 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with th | e correspondence address | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl' - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fi , cause the application to become ABANDO | e timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | · | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, | 453 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | , | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application | | • | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requirement. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | • • | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | * | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | • | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document | s have been received. | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau | u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | of the certified copies not rece | ived. | | | |
| ************************************** | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) 🔲 Interview Summ | any (PTO_413) | | | |
| 2) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mai | Date | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other: | al Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |
| | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 700 on page 13, line 19. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 25 recites the limitation "the voltage generator" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/716,762

Art Unit: 2827

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/716,749. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the elements recited in claims 1-28 of the present application are art recognize equivalent with claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/716,749.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

With regard to claims 1-28, the copending application Kim et al. (10/716,749) recited an apparatus and method of a memory device comprising: means for supplying temperature information, one or more voltage generators for generating voltage to be applied to substrate of the switching transistor or word line of one or more memory cells, wherein the voltage generator is configured to vary the level of the output voltage based on the temperature information.

Kim et al. disclose the claimed invention as noted above but not explicitly disclose wherein the voltage is negative with respective to ground reference.

However, Kim et al. disclose at lease one of the internally generated voltages is negative with respected to a ground reference (claim 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the voltage generator of Kim et al. for generating a negative internal voltage to

Art Unit: 2827

be applied to the one or more memory cell that base on the temperature information in order to provide a low power consumption, size reduction, highly efficiency voltage generating circuit for the semiconductor memory device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 18- 19, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Buskirk et al. (6,205,074) in view of Kearney (5,608,347).

Regarding to claims 18-19, 25, Van Buskirk et al. discloses a memory device comprising: means for supplying temperature information (24) indicative of a temperature of the memory device; a voltage generator/regulator (14) to generate a bias voltage to be applied to substrate of a switching transistor/word line of one or more of the memory cells; wherein the voltage generator is configured to vary the level of the bias voltage based on the temperature information, to lower level of the bias voltage as the temperature of the memory device increases. See Figs. 1-4; Cols. 5-12.

As per above discussion, Van Buskirk et al. disclose the claimed invention but lack an inclusion of wherein the voltage is negative with respective to ground reference.

Kearney disclose a temperature dependent voltage generator (214) for generating a negative voltage signal that is substantially proportional to the change of the operating temperature. See Figs. 6; Cols. 13, lines1-26.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Buskirk et al.'s voltage generator by utilizing Kearney's temperature dependent voltage generator to generate negative voltage that is substantially proportional to the change of the operating temperature to compensate for effort due to temperature variation within the memory device.

4. With regard to claims 1-4, 9-11, 14-15, they encompass the same scope of invention as to that of claims 18-19, 25 except they draft in method format instead of apparatus format. The claims are therefore rejected for the same reason as set forth above.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Di Iorio (6,738,297) discloses a low voltage current reference memory device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-1782. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-4:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/716,762

Art Unit: 2827

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoai Ho can be reached on 571-272-1777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Lam

March 31, 2005

DAVID LAM